

Request for Reconsideration:

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 24 are independent claims. Applicant is amending claims 1-23 merely to clarify the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. No excess claims fees are due as a result of these amendments. Nevertheless, in the event of any variance between the fees determined by Applicant and the fees determined by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO"), please charge such variance to the undersigned's **Deposit Account No. 02-0375**.

Remarks:

1. **Objections and Rejections.**

The Office Action objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because the drawings allegedly do not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶1, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶1, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses.

2. **Drawing Objections.**

As noted above, the Office Action objects to the drawings for allegedly not showing every feature of the claims. Applicant submits that additional drawings, **FIGs. 4-6**, taken together with the originally-filed drawings, **FIGs. 1-3**, show every feature of the claims. Applicant submits that these additional drawings do not introduce new matter and that they are fully supported by Applicant's originally filed disclosure, including the claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter additional **FIGs. 4-6** and withdraw the objection to the drawings.

3. **Enablement Rejections.**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-27, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant have submitted a substitute specification to facilitate understanding of the application, which claims priority to Spanish Patent Application No. 200300104. Applicant submits that substitute specification does not introduce new matter and is commensurate in scope with the originally filed disclosure, including the claims. Applicant

further submits that the substitute specification merely clarifies the invention. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the substitute specification complies with enablement requirement. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the enablement rejections of claims 1-27.

4. Written Description Rejections.

The Office Action rejects claims 24-27, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action contends that claims 24-27 constitutes new matter. In establishing the scope of the originally-filed disclosure, Applicant may rely upon specification, drawings, and claim as-filed. See MPEP 608.04. Applicant notes that the Preliminary Amendment adding claims 24-27 was filed with this application, and, thus, constitutes part of the originally-filed disclosure. See MPEP 608.04(b). Further, the originally-filed specification supports the recitation of springs in claim 24, as the originally-filed specification discloses that “[t]he arms supporting the roller (7) are provided with the relevant springs, which results in a certain resilience of the roller (7), since it permits the latter to adapt to the different types and thicknesses of mops, butts of handles, floor scrubbing devices, etc.” Published Patent Application No. US 2004/0143926 A1 to Moreno, Para. [0021]. Thus, Applicant demonstrated possession of the invention at the time the application was filed by describing springs in both the specification and the claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the written description requirement of claims 24-27.

5. Indefiniteness Rejections.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-27 as allegedly indefinite. Applicant is amending claims 1-23 to correct antecedent basis throughout these claims. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 24-27 provides proper antecedent basis for the described

elements and, thus, do not require amendment to overcome the indefiniteness rejections. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the indefiniteness rejections of claims 1-27.

Conclusion:


Applicant maintains that the above-captioned patent application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution of this application may be furthered by discussing the application, in person or by telephone, with Applicant's representative, we would welcome the opportunity to do so.

Applicants submit with this responsive amendment payment of \$60.00 for a one-month extension of time. Nevertheless, in the event of any variance between the fees determined by Applicants and the fees determined by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, please charge or credit any such variance to the undersigned's **Deposit Account No. 02-0375**.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Dated: April 18, 2007

By:


William S. Foster, Jr.
Registration No. 51,695

Baker Botts L.L.P.
The Warner
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2400
Tel.: (202) 639-7700
Fax: (202) 639-7890

WSF